

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

BRIAN E. CALHOUN, et al.,

Petitioners, : Case No. 3:15-cv-037

- vs -

District Judge Thomas M. Rose
Magistrate Judge Michael R. Merz

PETER TOBIN, United States Marshal,

:
Respondent.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This is a habeas corpus case brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 by two persons committed to the custody of the United States Marshal for civil contempt of court. On February 6, 2015, the Court ordered them to show cause by February 15, 2015, why they should not be remanded to their remedy at law by way of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (Doc. No. 5). They have filed no response.

It is accordingly recommended that this habeas corpus action be dismissed without prejudice.

February 19, 2015.

s/ *Michael R. Merz*
United States Magistrate Judge

NOTICE REGARDING OBJECTIONS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with this Report and Recommendations. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), this period is extended to seventeen days because this Report is being served by one of the methods of service listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), (D), (E), or (F). Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendations are based in whole or in part upon matters occurring of record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 153-55 (1985).